Town of Hinesburg
Development Review Board
March 3, 2015
Approved 3/17/15

Present: Dennis Place, Sarah Murphy, Ted Bloomhardt, Dick Jordan, Zoe Wainer, Andrea Bayer, Greg Waples.

Representing Applications: Jack Bird, Brett Grabowski, Mike Bouscher, Kevin J. Hylten

Public Present: Michael Bissonette, John Lyman, Dan Jacobs, John Kiedaisch.

Zoe W. chaired the meeting, which was called to order at 7:33pm. There were no agenda changes. There were no public comments for non-agenda items.

Zoe W. made a **motion to approve as amended the minutes of 2/17/15.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board voted **6-0.** Andrea B. abstained.

Hinesburg Center, LLC/Phase II: Sketch Plan—ct'd from 12/16 & 1/20. Mike B. demonstrated recent revisions to the proposal. Alex W. explained to the Board that the water capacity is not there for this project however wastewater capacity is. Peter E. said the Applicant is willing to have in conditions no allocations be held up.

The Applicant said regarding the current version of plans, the footprints shown are likely to be similar to what will be requested. Parking has been revised to bring some on-street parking off-street. An increased green space will provide community garden space.

Ted B. asked the Applicants about intended ownership of the area to the west. The Applicants said it will be held in title or, a long-term lease for use of that area. Alex W. noted that the FEMA mapped FHA does not include that area.

The area being referred to is in the Agricultural district, and some discussion was had about potential structures that may be allowed there, including barns, sheds, and other ag-related buildings. The Applicant said also, the original intent of that lot was to visually open it up, so that should also be considered.

The Applicant said after these current revisions are taken into account, the proposal is downsized by 5 single family lots which they note is a large financial impact to the project. They feel they have adequately addressed staff comments. They said there are some comments in the staff report which they do not agree with i.e., the thru road where the parking lot is.

Regarding the density component; the Applicant provided the Board with numbers which outline how the project acquires the density bonuses. They are still awaiting feedback from the Select Board with regard to the Important Public Infrastructure component (Sect. 2.9.2).

The Applicants provided the Board with some ideas of what the projected $40,000 looks like in terms of landscaping & a children's play area. They break this budget down to $30,000 to the play area &

$10,000 for the sidewalk connection. They also looked at the entire sidewalk build-out to include trees & landscaping. The budget equates to about $4.5K per unit. The Applicants said that if that cost were to go up much more, they would likely consider seeking an alternative density bonus i.e., solar array. There was some discussion about the clay soils in the area which may require some fill and grading of the site. The Applicant said they are willing to put the money wherever the Town sees fit i.e., here or another project such as the Rec Fields. Zoe W. said it would be good to seek Select Board guidance on where that money would be best spent. She said it may make more sense to get site work done first. Sarah M. said she is more inclined to do infrastructure and address drainage problems. The Applicant asked if the Board had any questions regarding the density of this project. The Board said no, the numbers seem clear.

The Applicant addressed parking, noting that staff felt that on-street parking should be removed. However, siting Section 5.22.2, the Applicants made it clear that Item #2 in this portion of the regulations addresses this and the language is "shall". That is what we are doing, said Mike B. The Applicant provided parking calculations which they noted were independently calculated for this phase. Looking at time of day factors, use requirements, etc., they feel that the estimates are a bit high in the retail numbers they have provided the Board so if anything, the numbers are conservative. Peak demand will be at 7pm weekdays, and will be 114 spaces. This proposal offers more than adequate parking in the Applicants' opinion.

Greg W. asked who maintains the on-street parking spaces in Phase I of this development. Brett G. said they hire Bob Wahl and they feel that his team does good work and they have heard no complaints regarding snow removal there. Peter E. said also, residents who share parking in these mixed-use shared parking lots want to be assured that they have a place relatively close to their doors and suggested considering designated spaces. The Applicant said that flies in the face of the shared parking premise and the ordinance of smart growth. Brett G. said many units in this phase have their own parking and all parking lots in this phase are close to the units they serve. He said there may in fact be some overflow into the parking available in phase I.

Zoe W. asked the Applicant if they considered a smaller building or breaking up the very large building in this phase. Brett G. said no, and noted that the proposed building has a smaller footprint than the Kinney Drugs building. He said they can address the height impact with rooflines, etc. Alex W. encouraged the Applicant to consider underground parking. The Applicant has concerns with regard to underground parking as it relates to the FHA and the need for additional fill. There is not enough engineering data at this time to determine the feasibility of this.

Zoe W. said she would like some input from the Select Board and would like to continue this discussion to cover remaining items. She opened discussion to the public.

John K. spoke from the audience, asking if the aforementioned agreement from the Applicant to sign off without allocation is in writing. Dick J. said the Board would put something like that in the final decision. John K. wondered if the aforementioned budget of $40K could be seed money for a park by the fire station. He also asked who designed the initial project. He said in his view, the Applicant has done a lot of work and the project has been greatly improved.

Brett G. said there is technically nothing preventing him as the developer from providing a temporary water source privately until the municipal capacity is available. Dan Jacobs spoke from the audience,

asking about storm water ponds for this Phase. Brett G. said the storm water facility will be to the west, possibly inside the floodplain area.

John Lyman spoke from the audience, asking if the Applicant is willing to take money he is considering spending on a temporary water source and putting it towards a more permanent town wide solution? Brett G. said yes, he is open to such a discussion.

Zoe W. made a **motion to continue the public hearing to 3/17/15 and asked staff to get feedback from the Select Board.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

Jody & Judy Johnson: Revision to Final Plat- Judy's brother, Kevin Hylten represented this application which seeks a revision to the final subdivision plat in order to revise the current building envelope to accommodate the placement of a detached garage on the north end of the existing driveway. Zoe W. asked if the Applicants intend to remove any of the existing maple trees which are in the area where the revised building envelope would go. Kevin H. said they would like to avoid cutting if they can, but the project may require some tree removal. The Applicants will consider, if the Board wishes, planting some type of screening to replace removed trees.

Greg W. said he was personally reluctant to approve this request, saying the home owners bought the lot knowing what the approved building envelope was. Kevin H. said they feel this is not a big shift from the intent of the current building envelope and noted this was an attempt to accommodate changing family needs.

Dennis P. said in his view, the Applicants have every right to cut those existing trees regardless of the building envelope revision. Ted B. said he takes into consideration the fact that there appears to be no feedback from neighboring property owners opposed to any potential cutting.

The Applicant said they are amenable to reconfiguring the revised envelope to avoid most of the trees. Zoe W. opened the discussion to the public.

John L. asked from the audience if the building envelope must be symmetrical. Zoe W. said no. Greg W. said if the Applicants can minimize tree cutting, he would be ok with the request for revision. The Applicant agreed with the Board and they decided to add 8' to the south side of the proposed revised building envelope to accommodate a single take-out of 35' X 25' for the proposed garage area to the north.

Zoe W. made a **motion to direct staff to redraft the approval to reflect this change and to vote on the revisions at the 3-17-15 meeting.** Ted B. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

Jack Bird: Transfer of Land to Adjoiner (BLA). The Applicant is requesting an interior boundary line adjustment between two properties, owned and co-owned by the Applicant. The aim is to shift a majority of the land to Lot A. New deeds will reflect the ROW's of the original property, Lot B.

Ted B. made a **motion to find this application is not a subdivision.** Greg W. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0.**

Greg W. made a **motion to go into deliberative session to discuss the Mobbs and Haystack application decisions.** Dick J. **seconded the motion.** The Board **voted 7-0** and entered deliberative session at 9:30pm.

Other Business:

The meeting adjourned at 10:30pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Freeda Powers, Recording Secretary